



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

redeeming and illumining and uplifting love of God in Christ. Its claim to perfectness and finality is always to be subject to the testing of its power to do all this, in truth and in fact, so as to satisfy the ever rising and more exacting demands for satisfaction of the ideals of the religious consciousness.

On account of its vastness and the imperfection of the workmen, but especially on account of the unfaithfulness and selfishness of the Christian church itself, this task can, in this age, be only very imperfectly accomplished. It will be something new and different in each age to come. For, while the individual believer may attain to confidence in the redeeming work done by the spirit of Christ upon his own soul, Christianity can prove its claim to absoluteness and finality, amidst and over the other religions of the world, and in the face of all the tendencies to agnosticism and irreligion, only by the progressive actualization of its own ideal of the perfect kingdom of God among men. This is to say, that, as for the individual, so for the race, the blessed and complete experience of this kingdom will be its own quite satisfying proof. The final and conclusive apologetics will be the experience of the redeemed race.

GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD.

YALE UNIVERSITY.
New Haven, Conn.

THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

IN the introduction to his book Professor Giesebrecht¹ frankly takes his readers into his confidence. He speaks of the extraordinary differences of opinion among recent scholars concerning the Deutero-Isaian Servant of Yahweh. He has the impression that out of all this confusion there are now emerging signs of an approaching common consent. He hopes to contribute something toward making this common opinion definite and certain. He has not rushed prematurely into print, but has waited until he could be sure of the ripeness of his conclusions.

After the introduction he takes up one by one, under the designation of *Ebedstücke*, four short passages in Isaiah, namely 42: 1-4; 49: 1-6; 50: 4-9; 52: 13-53: 12. After discussing these in detail, he presents a translation of them, and a summary of the conclusions reached. Then, in the second half of the book, he treats of their

¹ *Der Knecht Jahves des Deuterojesaia*. Von FRIEDRICH GIESEBRECHT. Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann (Ferd. Beyer's Buchhandlung), 1902. iv + 208 pages. M. 5.60.

relation to Deutero-Isaiah taken as a whole. In the course of these discussions he pays his respects to most of the recent writers on the subject, including, for example, Budde, Duhm, Sellin, Laue, Bertholet, Cheyne, Kittel, Rothstein, Füllkrug, Marti, Smend, Ley, Schian, and others. The quality of the work is such as to justify his claim that he has taken time for thorough and deliberate study.

His central proposition is that the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is the Israelitish people personified. This proposition he has made good, though his argument is not to be equally commended in all its parts. Perhaps some scholar of the year 2000 A. D. will say of it that it has the characteristic excellences and the characteristic weaknesses of the criticism current at the beginning of the twentieth century.

To mention, for illustration, one line of weaknesses, the opponents of Professor Giesebrecht's opinion allege that the Servant is often spoken of as having a mission to the Israelitish people, and, therefore, cannot be the Israelitish people. Giesebrecht meets this by text emendation. In the passages cited against his view he discovers that the meter requires the lines to be lengthened or shortened or dropped or replaced by lines consisting of different words, and when he gets the lines properly reconstructed they no longer contain anything contrary to his proposition. It must not be inferred that he is more given than others to text-mending. On the contrary, he is quite conservative in this matter, regarding as needless many of the changes proposed by other scholars. And his text-criticism is probably not more prejudiced by his theory than that of other men. All the same, his corrected text is the text of Giesebrecht, and not that of Deutero-Isaiah.

His proposition, however, is true, provided the terms are rightly conceived. In the sense in which it is true that the Servant is the Israelitish people personified, personification is not a mere figure of speech; it involves also the recognition of the fact that a people is an organic unit. In law we speak of a business organization as a corporate person. In its corporate personal character it has rights and obligations, and is subject to rewards and punishments. We apply the same modes of speaking to other aggregates of individuals. We speak of the German people or of the American church as an organic whole, having a character and duties like a person. We use this form of conception in spite of our weak way of representing a people by a neuter or a plural pronoun. Much more is it found in the Hebrew in connection with the virile and picturesque representa-

tion of a people by a masculine singular pronoun. We would say of the German people, *It* confers benefits on mankind through its achievements in thrift and learning and art. In Hebrew one would say of the German people, *He* confers benefits on mankind.

There is nothing to prevent such a personified aggregate from having relations with itself or its members, as well as with the world outside it. Even an individual has relations with himself, owes duties to himself, may be in conflict with himself, should respect himself. In a more marked sense the same is true of a personified aggregate. The German people has duties to itself, and to the persons that constitute it. The American church has obligations to itself and to its members. If the Servant is Israel personified, that does not exclude him from having a mission to Israel or to Israelites. In order to prove that Israel is the Servant, we have no need to get rid of the texts that affirm that the Servant has a mission to Israel.

Further, when Deutero-Isaiah identifies the Servant with Israel, it is never with Israel as a mere political or ethnical aggregate of persons; invariably it is with Israel as the medium of Yahweh's gracious purpose for the nations. Giesebrecht is correct in saying that the personified Israel is not some part of the people, for example, not those who stand with the prophets, or the pious kernel within Israel, but the whole people. Nevertheless it is the ideal Israel, the eternal Israel contemplated in Yahweh's purpose and promise, and not merely the concrete Israel existing at any given point of time. This dual conception of Israel is found in different parts of the Old Testament. In the latter chapters of Leviticus and Deuteronomy we find Yahweh's promise to Israel conditioned on obedience, but in those chapters we are also told that no degree of disobedience by Israel will annul the eternal covenant. A similar dualism of statement occurs in the passages that speak of David and his eternal seed and kingdom. The conception of Israel in his own character is one conception; that of Israel as the called of God for the sake of the nations is another. When we note this distinction, it is all the more evident that Israel the Servant, while from one point of view identical with Israel the ethnical aggregate, may from another point of view be thought of as having a mission to the latter, as well as to the outside nations.

Further still, any Israelite, so far forth as he has Israelitish characteristics, may be taken, within limits, as a type of the whole people. In particular, any Israelite who is imbued with the spirit of Israel's

call for the sake of mankind, may so far forth be regarded as a type of the ideal Israel. Within limits, that which is true of the people is true of any typical individual among the people. I think there is no instance in Deutero-Isaiah in which the term "Servant" is applied to the prophet himself or to any other individual Israelite of his time; but if there were, that would not necessarily conflict with the proposition that the Servant is Israel.

All the more, if the history of the world presents us with any one person who is peculiarly and uniquely a typical Israelite, who stands by himself as the representative of Yahweh's promise to the nations through Israel, whose experiences and character and relations to the world are such that Israel's mission to the world culminates in him, then it is correct to apply directly to that person the statements made in Deutero-Isaiah concerning Israel the Servant. The writers of the New Testament regard Jesus Christ as such a person. Because they so regard him they apply to him the utterances concerning the Servant. Their doing so is not a matter of accommodating interpretation, but is as correct critically as it is magnificent in the conception of human history which it implies.

WILLIS J. BEECHER.

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Auburn, N. Y.

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.¹

PROFESSOR LOBSTEIN'S *Introduction* was originally published in French in 1896. In the following year it appeared in a German translation. The publication of an English translation of this admirable manual will be welcomed by many American students of theology. There is no other book which precisely serves its purpose, and none could serve it more successfully. It is primarily a treatise on the nature, task, sources, and method of Protestant theology. The author contrasts what he holds to be the true procedure in theology with the Roman Catholic method and with the Romanizing method so common still in Protestant dogmatics. The book is a plea for the theology of Christian experience. For the writer theology is the science of the Christian faith. The various positions taken in defense of this conception are in essential accord with the principles of Ritschl. There is probably no other book of equal size in English by means of which

¹*An Introduction to Protestant Dogmatics.* By P. LOBSTEIN. Authorized translation from the original French edition, by ARTHUR MAXSON SMITH. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902. 275 pages. \$2.